

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-15 stand rejected. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to.

Claims 2, 9, and 12-15 have been cancelled herein.

Claim 16 has been newly added. Claim 16 includes the subject matter of the original claim 5, which has been removed from claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 2 and 9.

Claim 9 was found allowable with claims 1 and 2 in the Office Action of June 7, 2004 without the subject matter of claim 5 being in claim 1.

Claims 1 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over applicants admitted prior in view of Erickson et al. (US 6,067,457).

Claims 12-15 have been cancelled herein obviating their rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claims 2 and 9 and the prior features of claim 5 removed. The features of claims 9 and 2 were found allowable without the features of claim 5 in the Office Action of June 7, 2004.

It is respectfully requested the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn because the combination of references fails to show or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and should likewise be allowed.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also rejected as unparentable over applicants admitted prior art in view of Havens (US 6,735,175). Since these claims depend from claim 1 it is believed that the Erickson et al. reference should have been cited. However these claims should likewise be allowed since they depend from claim 1.

It is respectfully requested that all prior art rejections be withdrawn.

The claim rejections of 1-2, 4, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112:

The inadvertently deleted line 7 of the original claim 1, has been amended back into claim 1.


Regarding the rejection reason paragraph 4, the working of "the read out service type" recited in claim 9, lines 11 and 12 refers to the read out service type of line 8 of claim 9. The language has been amended to clarify the claimed feature.

Regarding the rejection reason paragraph 5, the wording of "the read out service type" recited in claim 10, lines 7 and 8 refers to the read out service type of line 4 of claim 10. The language has been amended to clarify the claimed feature.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

**CUSTOMER NO.: 026304**  
**TELEPHONE NO.: (212) 940-8703**  
**FAX NO.: (212) 940-8986/7**  
**Attorney Docket No.: FUJY 18.089 (100794-11589)**  
BSM fd